

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 have been previously canceled; claims 12-16 are currently canceled. Claims 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 26, 27, 30 and 31 have been amended by way of this response. No new claims have been added. Thus, claims 17-31 are currently pending and presented for examination.

Response to claim objections:

Claims 22, 23, 26 and 27 are objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended claims 22, 23, 26 and 27 according to the examiner's remarks and respectfully requests the examiner to withdraw the claim objections.

Response to rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112:

Claims 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 12 has been canceled. However, the elements of claim 12 have been incorporated into claim 17 and applicant has amended these elements according to the examiner's remarks.

Claim 22 has been amended in accordance with claim 12 and applicant respectfully requests the examiner to withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Request for allowance:

In the instant office action the examiner indicates that claims 17-21 contain patentable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and if overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112. Applicant has rewritten claim 17 in such a manner. Further, the examiner indicates that claims 23-25 and 28-31 are allowable.

Claims 26 and 27 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and if overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112. Applicant respectfully submits that there are no rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 in the instant office action. Applicant has not rewritten claims 26 and 27 in independent form as these claims depend on allowable claim 23.

Response to rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102:

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Winsel (US 3,785,870).

Independent claim 22 has been amended and now recites:

“...

a purifying device comprising an ion exchanger for reducing the impurities of the operating liquid,

wherein a signal is output when an upper limit value of the impurities in the operating liquid is exceeded.”

Support for these amendment may be found for example in paragraphs [00013] and [00032] of the specification. No new matter has been added.

Applicant respectfully submits that in particular Winsel does not teach or suggest that a signal is output when an upper limit value of the impurities in the operating liquid is exceeded. Thus, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding office action are inapplicable to the present claims. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including fees for additional claims and terminal disclaimer fee, or credit any overpayments to deposit account no. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 6, 2010

By: Tina Gonka

Tina Gonka
Limited Recognition No. L0623
(407) 736-4005

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830